



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/625,042

07/22/2003

Remo Anton Hochstrasser

21272 US

1081

151 7590 06/12/2007
HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE INC.
PATENT LAW DEPARTMENT
340 KINGSLAND STREET
NUTLEY, NJ 07110

EXAMINER

SIEFKE, SAMUEL P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1743

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/625,042

Applicant(s)

HOCHSTRASSER ET AL.

Examiner

Samuel P. Siefke

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 1743

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/50121 (herein after WO '121).

Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by WO 01/50121 (herein after WO '121) in view of Moi et al. (USPN 5,938,906).

WO '121 discloses a method for removing a gelatinous material that comprises the steps of separating a gel cutting from the gel (page 2, lines 29-31), placing the cut gel in a new container (page 3, lines 28-32, page 5, lines 7-9) and covering the gel cutting with an equilibrating fluid (processing solution, page 10, lines 11-20). WO '121 states the processing fluid is pre-filled within the multi-well processing plate 32 and the gel fragment is placed therein. It appears the gel perimeter of the gel cutting is approximately equal to the perimeter of the new container (fig. 3e). The Examiner is interpreting that when the gel is placed with in the processing plate containing the processing fluid, the gel is covered with the processing fluid after the gel is placed therein because the gel would sink or the user would submerge the cut gel so the processing fluid would cover the entire surface area of the cut gel. Regarding the cut gell having an edge that contours to the receiving processing fluid, it is the Examiner's interpretation that the cutting tip has a negative bevel which allows for easier excision of

Art Unit: 1743

the spots, bands, or plaques from the gel 34. As seen in figure 3a-3e, the gel 34 is cut and a portion is removed and placed in the processing well 32. The gel conforms the inside of the processing well because it is smaller and has parallel sides that has the same contours of the well. Therefore the gel can be moved around within the processing well because there is a space between the gel and the sidewall of the processing well. WO '121 further states that different sizes of cutting can be cut out of the gel depending on the size of the spots, bands or plaques (page 10, line 33- page 11, line 9). If a larger spot were to be excised, the larger cutting would inherently consume the entire space in the processing well 32 and would thereby be immovably disposed therein.

WO '121 does not teach a gel cutting containing a plurality of concentration points of different substances, holding the gel in the processing well by clamping means or covering the gel with an equilibrating fluid before cutting.

Regarding the newly amended claims having the limitation of the gel cutting containing a plurality of concentration points of different substances. It is well known in the art that gel slabs are employed to perform analysis on a plurality of different samples on the same slab. It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify WO '121 to employ cutting of the gel slab to include a plurality of samples therein on the cutting to a container for further sampling because it would allow for screening multiple different samples with one test substance. This screening is routinely employed for testing diverse samples against one test drug. Moi teaches a casting cassette for gel electrophoresis that comprises clamps for holding

Art Unit: 1743

the gel within the container (fig. 5a-5d). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify WO '121 to employ a clamp to hold the cut gel in the processing well to prevent the gel cutting from moving around in the container and preventing unwanted movement therein. Regarding claim 7, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify WO '121 to cover the pre-cut gel with a processing fluid to prepare the gel for cutting. This is well known in the art of electrophoresis.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 1743

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel P. Siefke whose telephone number is 571-272-1262. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00am-5:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on 571-272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sam P. Siefke



June 11, 2007


Jill Warden
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700